arXiv:1412.8558v2 [math.RA] 24 Apr 2015

CONGRUENCES IN SLIM, PLANAR, SEMIMODULAR LATTICES: THE SWING LEMMA

G. GRÄTZER

Abstract. In an earlier paper, to describe how a congruence spreads from a prime interval to another in a finite lattice, I introduced the concept of prime-perspectivity and its transitive extension, prime-projectivity and proved the Prime-projectivity Lemma.

In this paper, I specialize the Prime-projectivity Lemma to slim, planar, semimodular lattices to obtain the Swing Lemma, a very powerful description of the congruence generated by a prime interval in this special class of lattices.

1. Introduction

To describe how a congruence spreads from a prime interval to another in a finite lattice L, I introduced the concept of prime-perspectivity in [11].

Let L be a finite lattice and let I and J be intervals of L. Figure 1 depicts the binary relation I *down-perspective to* J, in formula, $I \overset{\text{dn}}{\sim} J$. We define dually the binary relation I *up-perspective to* J, in formula, $I \overset{\text{up}}{\sim} J$. Finally, let I be *perspective to* J, in formula, $I \sim J$, if $I \overset{\text{dn}}{\sim} J$ or $I \overset{\text{up}}{\sim} J$.



Figure 1. Introducing prime-perspectivity

Now let $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ be prime intervals of L. In the second diagram in Figure 1, $\mathfrak{q}$ is collapsed by $\text{con}(\mathfrak{p})$, but we cannot get from $\mathfrak{p}$ to $\mathfrak{q}$ by a sequence of down- and up-perspectivities between prime intervals. So we introduce a more general step

Date: April 21, 2015.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 06C10, 06B10.

Key words and phrases. Prime-perspective, congruence, congruence-perspective, perspective, prime interval.

between two prime intervals: $\mathfrak{p}$ is *prime-perspective down* to $\mathfrak{q}$ (in formula, $\mathfrak{p} \xrightarrow{\text{p-dn}} \mathfrak{q}$) if $\mathfrak{p}$ is down-perspective to $[0_\mathfrak{p} \wedge 1_\mathfrak{q}, 1_\mathfrak{q}]$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ is contained in $[0_\mathfrak{p} \wedge 1_\mathfrak{q}, 1_\mathfrak{q}]$. If $\mathfrak{p} \xrightarrow{\text{p-dn}} \mathfrak{q}$, then $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ generate an N_5, as in the second diagram of Figure 1, or a $\mathsf{B}_2 = \mathsf{C}_2^2$, as in the first diagram of Figure 1, or C_2, if $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q}$.

We define *prime-perspective up*, in formula, $\mathfrak{p} \xrightarrow{\text{p-up}} \mathfrak{q}$, dually. Let *prime-perspective*, in formula, $\mathfrak{p} \xrightarrow{\text{p}} \mathfrak{q}$, mean that $\mathfrak{p} \xrightarrow{\text{p-up}} \mathfrak{q}$ or $\mathfrak{p} \xrightarrow{\text{p-dn}} \mathfrak{q}$ and let *prime-projective*, in formula, $\mathfrak{p} \xRightarrow{\text{p}} \mathfrak{q}$, be the transitive extension of $\xrightarrow{\text{p}}$.

Now we state the main result of G. Grätzer [11]: we only have to go through prime intervals by prime-perspectivities to spread a congruence from a prime interval to another in a finite lattice.

Prime-projectivity Lemma. *Let L be a finite lattice and let $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ be distinct prime intervals in L. Then $\mathfrak{q}$ is collapsed by* $\operatorname{con}(\mathfrak{p})$ *iff $\mathfrak{p} \xRightarrow{p} \mathfrak{q}$, that is, iff there exists a sequence of pairwise distinct prime intervals $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{u}_0, \mathfrak{u}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{u}_n = \mathfrak{q}$ satisfying*

$$\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{u}_0 \xrightarrow{p} \mathfrak{u}_1 \xrightarrow{p} \cdots \xrightarrow{p} \mathfrak{u}_n = \mathfrak{q}. \tag{1}$$

Let us call a lattice L an *SPS lattice*, if it is slim (contains no M_3 sublattice), planar, and semimodular. Note that an SPS lattice is finite by definition.

For the prime intervals $\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q}$ of an SPS lattice L, we define a new binary relation: $\mathfrak{p}$ *swings* to $\mathfrak{q}$, in formula, $\mathfrak{p} \curvearrowright \mathfrak{q}$, if $1_\mathfrak{p} = 1_\mathfrak{q}$, the element $1_\mathfrak{p} = 1_\mathfrak{q}$ covers at least three elements, and $0_\mathfrak{q}$ is neither the left-most nor the right-most element covered by $1_\mathfrak{p} = 1_\mathfrak{q}$. We say that $\mathfrak{p} \curvearrowright \mathfrak{q}$ is *established by* an N_7 sublattice of L, if the N_7 is generated by $0_\mathfrak{p}$, $0_\mathfrak{q}$, and a third element covered by $1_\mathfrak{p}$.

See Figure 2 for two examples.

Swing Lemma. *Let L be an SPS lattice and let $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ be distinct prime intervals in L. Then $\mathfrak{q}$ is collapsed by* $\operatorname{con}(\mathfrak{p})$ *iff there exists a prime interval $\mathfrak{r}$ such that $\mathfrak{p}$ is up-perspective to $\mathfrak{r}$ and there exists a sequence of prime intervals and a sequence of binary relations*

$$\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{r}_0 \, \varrho_1 \, \mathfrak{r}_1 \, \varrho_2 \, \mathfrak{r}_2 \ldots \varrho_n \, \mathfrak{r}_n = \mathfrak{q}, \tag{2}$$

where each relation ϱ_i is $\overset{\text{dn}}{\sim}$ or $\curvearrowright$.

In addition, the sequence (2) *also satisfies*

$$1_{\mathfrak{r}_0} \geq 1_{\mathfrak{r}_1} \geq \cdots \geq 1_{\mathfrak{r}_n}. \tag{3}$$



FIGURE 2. Swings, $\mathfrak{p} \curvearrowright \mathfrak{q}$

If we choose a shortest sequence in the Swing Lemma, then the prime intervals $\mathfrak{r} = \mathfrak{r}_0, \mathfrak{r}_1, \mathfrak{r}_2, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_n = \mathfrak{q}$ are pairwise distinct and the down-perspectivities alternate with the swings.

The Swing Lemma is easy to visualize. Up-perspectivity is "climbing up", down-perspectivity is "sliding down". So we get from $\mathfrak{p}$ to $\mathfrak{q}$ by climbing up once, and then alternating sliding down and swinging.

In this paper we give an elementary proof of this result. "Elementary" means that we do not use the deep techniques and results developed for rectangular lattices in G. Czédli [1]. An alternative proof of the Swing Lemma can be found in G. Czédli [3].

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Fork construction.** The following lemma is implicitly used in G. Czédli and E. T. Schmidt [7]:

Lemma 1. *Let K be an SPS lattice. Let $S = \{o, a_{\mathrm{l}}, a_{\mathrm{r}}, t\}$ be a covering square of K, and let a_{l} be to the left of a_{r}. Then there are maximal chains*

$$a_{\mathrm{l}} = x_{l,1} \succ x_{l,2} \succ \cdots \succ x_{l,n_l},$$
$$o = y_{l,1} \succ y_{l,2} \succ \cdots \succ y_{l,n_l},$$

such that x_{l,n_l} and y_{l,n_l} are on the left boundary of K and the interval $[y_{l,n_l}, a_{\mathrm{l}}]$ is isomorphic to $\mathsf{C}_2 \times \mathsf{C}_{n_l}$, and symmetrically.

Let

$$G[S] = S \cup \{x_{l,1}, x_{l,2}, \ldots, x_{l,n_l}\} \cup \{y_{l,1}, y_{l,2}, \ldots, y_{l,n_l}\}$$
$$\cup \{x_{r,1}, x_{r,2}, \ldots, x_{r,n_r}\} \cup \{y_{r,1}, y_{r,2}, \ldots, y_{r,n_r}\}.$$

Then $G[S]$ is a join-subsemilattice of K. Furthermore, K is a cover-preserving extension of $G[S]$.

As in G. Czédli and E. T. Schmidt [7], *inserting a fork* into K at the covering square S adds the elements

$$F[S] = \{m, z_{l,1} \succ \cdots \succ z_{l,n_l}, z_{r,1} \succ \cdots \succ z_{r,n_r}\}, \tag{4}$$

see Figure 4, so that the interval $[o, t]$ turns into an N_7 (see Figure 5), and the interval $[y_{l,n_l}, a_{\mathrm{l}}]$ becomes isomorphic to $\mathsf{C}_3 \times \mathsf{C}_{n_l}$, and symmetrically. Let $K[S]$ denote this construct. Then $K[S]$ is an SPS lattice, as observed in G. Czédli and E. T. Schmidt [7]. See Figure 6 for an illustration; the black filled elements form $F[S]$.

2.2. **SPS lattices.** For an overview of this topic, see G. Czédli and G. Grätzer [4], Chapter 3 of G. Grätzer and F. Wehrung eds. [24].

Let us call the elements $u, v, w \in L$ *pairwise disjoint over the element a* provided that $a = u \wedge v = v \wedge w = w \wedge u$.

The first, third, and fourth statement of the next lemma can be found in the literature (see G. Grätzer and E. Knapp [17]–[21], G. Czédli and E. T. Schmidt [6]–[7]).

Lemma 2. *Let L be an SPS lattice.*

(i) *An element of L has at most two covers.*
(ii) *If the elements $u, v, w \in L$ are pairwise disjoint over a, then two of them are comparable.*



FIGURE 3. $G[S]$, a join-subsemilattice of K

(iii) *Let $x \in L$ cover three distinct elements u, v, and w. Then the set $\{u, v, w\}$ generates an N_7 sublattice.*
(iv) *If the elements u, v, and w are adjacent, then the N_7 sublattice of* (iii) *is a cover-preserving sublattice.*
(v) *Let $\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q}$ be distinct prime intervals of L. If $\mathfrak{p} \smile \mathfrak{q}$, then $0_\mathfrak{q}$ is a meet-irreducible element.*

Proof. To verify (ii), let the elements $u, v, w \in L$ be pairwise disjoint over the element $a \in L$. By way of contradiction, assume that no two of them are comparable. Then, in particular, the elements u, v, w are pairwise distinct. So $a < u$, $a < v$, $a < w$. We can choose $a \prec u' \leq u$, $a \prec v' \leq v$, $a \prec w' \leq w$. The elements u', v', w' are pairwise distinct. Indeed, if say, $u' = v'$, then $u' = v' \leq u \wedge v$, contradicting that $a = u \wedge v$. So the elements u', v', w' are pairwise distinct and cover a, contradicting (i). Finally, (v) follows from (iv). □

Lemma 2(i) and (ii) state in different ways that there are only two directions "to go up" from an element. The next lemma states this in one more way. This important statement follows from [5, Lemma 2.8].

Lemma 3. *Let L be an SPS lattice. Let $\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{q}_1, \mathfrak{q}_2$ be pairwise distinct prime intervals of L satisfying $\mathfrak{q}_1 \overset{\text{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{q}$ and $\mathfrak{q}_2 \overset{\text{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{q}$. Then $\mathfrak{q}_1 \sim \mathfrak{q}_2$.*

Lemma 3 can also be derived from Lemma 2, see the arXiv version of this paper.

An SPS lattice L is called a *slim patch lattice* if it has exactly two dual atoms that meet in 0. For a slim patch lattice L, we shall use the notation: $\mathfrak{p}_\mathrm{l}$ and $\mathfrak{p}_\mathrm{r}$ are the two prime intervals on the top boundaries of L and $\mathfrak{p}_\mathrm{l} = [c_\mathrm{l}, 1_L]$ on the left, $\mathfrak{p}_\mathrm{r} = [c_\mathrm{r}, 1_L]$ on the right.

The following result can be found in G. Czédli and E. T. Schmidt [6].



FIGURE 4. $F[S]$ inserted



FIGURE 5. The lattice N_7

Structure Theorem for Slim Patch Lattices. *Let L be a slim patch lattice. Then we can obtain L from the 4-element Boolean lattice $\mathsf{B}_2 = \mathsf{C}_2^2$ by a series of fork insertions.*

3. Two lemmas

The following lemma is a crucial step in the proof of the Swing Lemma.

Lemma 4. *Let L be an SPS lattice. Let $N = \{o, u, i, v, w\}$ be an N_5 sublattice of L, with $o < u < i$ and $o < v < w < i$. Let us assume that $[v, w]$ is a prime interval. Let $u \leq x \prec i$. Then $y = x \wedge w < v$.*

Proof. There are three mutually exclusive possibilities: $y \geq v$, $y \parallel v$, and $y < v$.

Since $i = u \vee v$, we cannot have $y \geq v$, because it would imply that $x = u \vee v$.



FIGURE 6. Inserting a fork: K, S, and $K[S]$

We want to prove that $y < v$. So by way of contradiction, let us assume that

$$y \parallel v, \tag{5}$$

see the first diagram of Figure 7. Define the elements o_l and o_r satisfying

$$o \prec o_l \leq u \text{ and } o \prec o_r \leq v, \tag{6}$$

see the second diagram of Figure 7. Since $u \wedge v = 0$, it follows that $o_l \wedge o_r = 0$. Note that

$$o_l \not\leq y. \tag{7}$$

Indeed, if $o_l \leq y$, then $o_l \leq y \leq w$, and so $o_l \leq u \wedge w = o$, contradicting (6).

We can further assume that

$$o_r < y. \tag{8}$$

Since $o_r = y$ contradicts (5), if (8) fails, then $o_r \not\leq y$. Thus $o_l \wedge o_r = o_l \wedge y = o_r \wedge y$, contradicting Lemma 2(ii), and thereby verifying (8).

So we have (5)–(8). It follows that $o_r < v$; indeed if $o_r = v$, then $v < y$, contradicting (5). Let $z = y \wedge v$. Since $o_r < v$, and by (6), $o_r < y$; therefore,



FIGURE 7. The elements for Lemma 4

$o_r \leq z$ and $z < v$ by (5). Also, $z \prec z \vee o_l \neq y$ by semimodularity and (7). Then $(z \vee o_l) \wedge y = (z \vee o_l) \wedge v = y \wedge v$, contradicting Lemma 2(ii). □

The next statement is a very special case of the Swing Lemma; it is also a crucial step in its proof. We are considering the following condition for a slim patch lattice K:

(SL) Let $\mathfrak{q}$ be a prime interval of K on the lower right boundary of K, that is, let $1_\mathfrak{q} \leq c_\mathrm{r}$. Then there exists a sequence of prime intervals $\mathfrak{p}_\mathrm{l} = \mathfrak{r}_0, \mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_n = \mathfrak{q}$ such that $\mathfrak{r}_i$ is down-perspective to or swings to $\mathfrak{r}_{i+1}$ for $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$.

Lemma 5. *Let K be a slim patch lattice and let $S = \{o, a_\mathrm{l}, a_\mathrm{r}, t\}$ be a covering square of K, with a_l to the left of a_r. If* (SL) *hold in K, then* (SL) *also holds in $K[S]$.*

Proof. Note that $\mathfrak{p}_\mathrm{l}$ and $\mathfrak{p}_\mathrm{r}$ are also the two prime intervals of $K[S]$ on the top boundaries of $K[S]$; the elements c_l and c_r are also remain the same..

To verify (SL) for $K[S]$, let $\mathfrak{q}$ be a prime interval of $K[S]$ on the lower right boundary, that is, $1_\mathfrak{q} \leq c_\mathrm{r}$.

If $K = \mathsf{B}_2$, then (SL) is trivial because $K[S] = \mathsf{N}_7$. So we can assume that $K \ncong \mathsf{B}_2$.

There are two cases to consider.

Case 1: $\mathfrak{q} \subseteq K$. Since $\mathfrak{q}$ is prime in $K[S]$ and $\mathfrak{q} \subseteq K$, it follows that $\mathfrak{q}$ is prime in K. So we can apply (SL) to $\mathfrak{q}$ in K, to obtain a shortest sequence of prime intervals in K and a sequence of binary relations

$$\mathfrak{p}_\mathrm{l} = \mathfrak{r}_0 \; \varrho_1 \; \mathfrak{r}_1 \; \varrho_2 \; \mathfrak{r}_2 \ldots \varrho_n \; \mathfrak{r}_n = \mathfrak{q}, \tag{9}$$

where each relation ϱ_i is $\overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim}$ or $\hookrightarrow$. If all the $\mathfrak{r}_i$ are prime intervals in $K[S]$, then the sequence (9) verifies (SL) in $K[S]$ for $\mathfrak{q}$. So let some $\mathfrak{r}_i$ not be prime in $K[S]$; we choose the $\mathfrak{r}_j$ with the largest j so that $\mathfrak{r}_j$ is not a prime. Since no element of $F[S]$ (defined in (4), see also Figure 4) can be on the upper left boundary of L, we conclude that $j \neq 0$. Since $\mathfrak{q}$ is prime in K, it follows that $j \neq n$. Therefore,

$$0 < j < n \tag{10}$$

and the intervals $\mathfrak{r}_{j+1}, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_n = \mathfrak{q}$ are prime in $K[S]$, while the interval $\mathfrak{r}_j$ is not.

There are two possibilities: $\mathfrak{r}_j \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_{j+1}$ or $\mathfrak{r}_j \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{r}_{j+1}$ in K—note that $j+1 \leq n$ by (10). If $\mathfrak{r}_j \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_{j+1}$ in K, then $\mathfrak{r}_{j+1} \overset{\mathrm{up}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_j$ in K and in $K[S]$. Since $\mathfrak{r}_{j+1}$ is prime in $K[S]$ but $\mathfrak{r}_j$ is not, this conflicts with the semimodularity of $K[S]$. We conclude that $\mathfrak{r}_j \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{r}_{j+1}$. Let $\mathfrak{r}_j \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{r}_{j+1}$ be established by an N_7 generated by $0_{\mathfrak{r}_j}, 0_{\mathfrak{r}_{j+1}}, w$, where w is the right-most element covered by $1_{\mathfrak{r}_j}$ if $\mathfrak{r}_j$ is to the left of $\mathfrak{r}_{j+1}$ and the left-most element covered by $1_{\mathfrak{r}_j}$, otherwise. Note that $\{0_{\mathfrak{r}_j}, 0_{\mathfrak{r}_{j+1}}, w\}$ is a three-element set since $\mathfrak{r}_j \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{r}_{j+1}$.

Since $\mathfrak{r}_j$ is not prime in $K[S]$, it follows that $0_{\mathfrak{r}_j} < z < 1_{\mathfrak{r}_j}$ for some $z \in F[S]$. We cannot have $z = m$, because in $K[S]$, z is contained in an interval $[0_{\mathfrak{r}_j}, 1_{\mathfrak{r}_j}]$ that is prime in K, while m is not contained in an interval that is prime in K. We conclude that

$$z = z_{r,p}, \text{ for some } 1 \leq p \leq n_r, \tag{11}$$

or symmetrically. It follows that $[o, a_\mathrm{r}] \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_j$ in K and so

$$[b_\mathrm{r}, a_\mathrm{r}] \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} [z, 1_{\mathfrak{r}_j}]. \tag{12}$$

Since $\mathfrak{r}_j \prec \mathfrak{r}_{j+1}$ in K, it follows that $1_{\mathfrak{r}_j}$ covers at least three elements in K, and so $1_{\mathfrak{r}_j}$ covers at least three elements in $K[S]$. Therefore, in $K[S]$,

$$[z, 1_{\mathfrak{r}_j}] \prec \mathfrak{r}_{j+1}. \tag{13}$$

Since $[o, a_{\mathrm{r}}] \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_j$ and $\mathfrak{r}_{j-1} \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_j$, we can apply Lemma 3 to conclude that either

$$[o, a_{\mathrm{r}}] \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_{j-1} \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_j \tag{14}$$

or

$$\mathfrak{r}_{j-1} \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} [o, a_{\mathrm{r}}] \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_j. \tag{15}$$

If (14) holds, then $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}} \neq \mathfrak{r}_{j-2}$, since $[o, a_{\mathrm{r}}] \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_{j-1}$ and $[o, a_{\mathrm{r}}]$ is not on the left boundary of $K[S]$. So we have the prime interval $\mathfrak{r}_{j-2}$ satisfying that $\mathfrak{r}_{j-2} \prec \mathfrak{r}_{j-1}$. By Lemma 2.(v), $\mathfrak{r}_{j-2} \prec \mathfrak{r}_{j-1}$ cannot hold. So (15) holds.

By (10)–(13), and (15), the sequence of prime intervals with the binary relations

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}} = \mathfrak{r}_0 \varrho_1 \mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \varrho_{j-1}\mathfrak{r}_{j-1} \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} [a_{\mathrm{l}}, t] \prec [m, t] \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} [b_{\mathrm{r}} \wedge 1_{\mathfrak{r}_{j-1}}, 1_{\mathfrak{r}_{j-1}}] \prec \mathfrak{r}_{j+1} \varrho_{j+2} \ldots \varrho_n \mathfrak{r}_n = \mathfrak{q}$$

establishes (SL) for $K[S]$, see Figure 8.

Case 2: $\mathfrak{q} \nsubseteq K$. Since $\mathfrak{q} \nsubseteq K$ is a prime interval on the lower right boundary of $K[S]$, it follows that

$$\mathfrak{q} = [y_{r,n_r}, x_{r,n_r}]_{K[S]} = \{y_{r,n_r}, z, x_{r,n_r}\},$$

where $z = z_{r,n_r}$ using the notation of Figure 4, or symmetrically. Let $\mathfrak{q}_{\mathrm{up}} = [z_{r,n_r}, x_{r,n_r}]$ and $\mathfrak{q}_{\mathrm{dn}} = [y_{r,n_r}, z_{r,n_r}]$; they are prime intervals in $K[S]$ and $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{q}_{\mathrm{up}}$ or $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{q}_{\mathrm{dn}}$.

To verify Case 2, we have to prove (SL) in $K[S]$ for $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{q}_{\mathrm{up}}$ and $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{q}_{\mathrm{dn}}$.



FIGURE 8. Case 1 of Lemma 5

Let $\mathfrak{q}' = [0_{\mathfrak{q}_{\mathrm{dn}}}, 1_{\mathfrak{q}_{\mathrm{up}}}] = [y_{r,n_r}, x_{r,n_r}]$; it is a prime interval of K on the lower right boundary of K. By applying (SL) to K and $\mathfrak{q}'$, we obtain a shortest sequence of prime intervals in K and a sequence of binary relations

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}} = \mathfrak{r}_0 \, \varrho_1 \, \mathfrak{r}_1 \, \varrho_2 \, \mathfrak{r}_2 \ldots \varrho_n \, \mathfrak{r}_n = \mathfrak{q}', \tag{16}$$

where each relation ϱ_i is $\overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim}$ or $\hookrightarrow$. Utilizing that the lower right boundary of K is an interval, see G. Grätzer and E. Knapp [20, Lemma 4], the last step from $\mathfrak{r}_{n-1}$ to $\mathfrak{r}_n = \mathfrak{q}'$ cannot be a swing (if it were, $1_{\mathfrak{q}}$ would cover at least three elements; it covers exactly one), so $\mathfrak{r}_{n-1} \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_n = \mathfrak{q}'$ holds in K.

We have two subcases to consider.

Case 2a: $n = 1$, that is, $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}} = \mathfrak{r}_{n-1}$, see Figure 9. We cannot have $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{q}'$ because $\mathfrak{q}'$ is on the lower right boundary of K; therefore, $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}} \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{q}'$. We also have $[a_{\mathrm{l}}, t] \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{q}'$, so by Lemma 3, we obtain that $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}} \sim [a_{\mathrm{l}}, t]$. Since $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}}$ is the top left prime interval of K, it follows that $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}} \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} [a_{\mathrm{l}}, t]$. Then in $K[S]$, see Figure 4,

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}} \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} [a_{\mathrm{l}}, t] \hookrightarrow [m, t] \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{q}_{\mathrm{up}} \tag{17}$$

and of course, $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}} \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{q}_{\mathrm{dn}}$. This completes the verification of (SL) for $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}}$ and $\mathfrak{q}$.

Case 2b: $n > 1$, and so, $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}} \neq \mathfrak{r}_{n-1}$. We conclude that $\mathfrak{r}_{n-1} \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_n = \mathfrak{q}'$. Since $[o, a_{\mathrm{r}}] \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_n = \mathfrak{q}'$ also holds, we use Lemma 3 to obtain that

$$\mathfrak{r}_{n-1} \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} [o, a_{\mathrm{r}}] \tag{18}$$

or

$$[o, a_{\mathrm{r}}] \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_{n-1}. \tag{19}$$

But (19) would imply that $0_{\mathfrak{r}_{n-1}}$ is meet-reducible, contradicting that $0_{\mathfrak{r}_{n-1}}$ is not the left-most or right-most element covered by $1_{\mathfrak{r}_{n-2}} = 1_{\mathfrak{r}_{n-1}}$. We conclude that (18) holds.

Then $\mathfrak{r}_{n-2} \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{r}_{n-1}$ and $1_{\mathfrak{r}_{n-2}} = 1_{\mathfrak{r}_{n-1}}$ by the definition of the swing relation. The element $1_{\mathfrak{r}_{n-2}} = 1_{\mathfrak{r}_{n-1}}$ covers at least three elements and $0_{\mathfrak{r}_{n-1}}$ is not the left-most or right-most element covered by $1_{\mathfrak{r}_{n-2}} = 1_{\mathfrak{r}_{n-1}}$. We can also assume that $0_{\mathfrak{r}_{n-21}}$ is to the right of $0_{\mathfrak{r}_{n-2}}$ and the down-perceptivity $\mathfrak{r}_{n-1} \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{r}_n$ is also to the right, as in Figure 10. Then $\mathfrak{r}_{n-1} \overset{\mathrm{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{q}_{\mathrm{dn}}$ in $K[S]$. So the sequence

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}} = \mathfrak{r}_0, \mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_{n-1}, \mathfrak{q}_{\mathrm{dn}}$$

verifies (SL) for $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathrm{l}}$ and $\mathfrak{q}_{\mathrm{dn}}$. □

4. Proving the Swing Lemma

The following lemma almost yields the Swing Lemma.

Lemma 6. *Let L be an SPS lattice and let $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ be distinct prime intervals in L. If $\mathfrak{p} \overset{p\text{-}dn}{\longrightarrow} \mathfrak{q}$, then there exists a sequence of pairwise distinct prime intervals*

$$\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{r}_0, \mathfrak{r}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{r}_n = \mathfrak{q} \tag{20}$$

such that $\mathfrak{r}_i$ is down-perspective to or swings to $\mathfrak{r}_{i+1}$ for $i = 0, \ldots, n-1$.



FIGURE 9. Case 2a of Lemma 5



FIGURE 10. Case 2b of Lemma 5



FIGURE 11. The elements for the inductive step, Case 1 in Lemma 6

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{p} \xrightarrow{\text{p-dn}} \mathfrak{q}$. If $\mathfrak{p} \overset{\text{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{q}$ holds, then the statement is trivial. If $\mathfrak{p} \overset{\text{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{q}$ fails to hold, then we induct on the length of the interval $[1_\mathfrak{q}, 1_\mathfrak{p}]$, in formula, length$[1_\mathfrak{q}, 1_\mathfrak{p}]$.

For the induction base, let length$[1_\mathfrak{q}, 1_\mathfrak{p}] = 1$. Let L' be the interval $[0_\mathfrak{p} \wedge 1_\mathfrak{q}, 1_\mathfrak{p}]$ of L. Note that $\mathfrak{q} \subseteq [0_\mathfrak{p} \wedge 1_\mathfrak{q}, 1_\mathfrak{p}]$ and $\mathfrak{p} \xrightarrow{\text{p-dn}} \mathfrak{q}$ in L'. Since L' is a slim patch lattice, by the Structure Theorem for Slim Patch Lattices, we can obtain L' from the planar distributive lattice $D = \mathsf{B}_2$ by a series of fork insertions. Since D has property (SL) and fork insertions preserve (SL) by Lemma 5, it follows that (SL) hold in L'. So we obtain in L' the sequence (20), which of course, will serve in L as well.

For the induction step, let length$[1_\mathfrak{q}, 1_\mathfrak{p}] > 1$. So we can choose $1_\mathfrak{q} < c \prec 1_\mathfrak{p}$. Let $a = 0_\mathfrak{p} \wedge c$ and $d = 0_\mathfrak{p} \wedge 1_\mathfrak{q}$, see Figures 11 and 12, where the five black filled elements form a sublattice N_5 establishing that $\mathfrak{p} \xrightarrow{\text{p}} \mathfrak{q}$. Note that by assumption $d < 0_\mathfrak{q}$.

There are two cases to consider.

Case 1: $[a, c]$ is a prime interval. Let $\mathfrak{p}_1 = [a, c]$, see Figure 11. We claim that $\mathfrak{p}_1 \xrightarrow{\text{p}} \mathfrak{q}$. Indeed, $1_{\mathfrak{p}_1} = c > 1_\mathfrak{q}$ and

$$0_{\mathfrak{p}_1} \wedge 1_\mathfrak{q} = a \wedge 1_\mathfrak{q} = (0_\mathfrak{p} \wedge a) \wedge 1_\mathfrak{q} = a \wedge (0_\mathfrak{p} \wedge 1_\mathfrak{q}) = a \wedge d = d < 0_\mathfrak{q}. \tag{21}$$

If $a = a \vee 0_\mathfrak{q}$, then $0_\mathfrak{p} \vee 0_\mathfrak{q} = 0_\mathfrak{p}$, in conflict with the assumption that $\mathfrak{p} \xrightarrow{\text{p-dn}} \mathfrak{q}$. So $a < a \vee 0_\mathfrak{q} \leq c$; since $[a, c]$ is assumed to be a prime interval, it follows that $a \vee 0_\mathfrak{q} = c$. Along with (21), this verifies that $\mathfrak{p}_1 \xrightarrow{\text{p}} \mathfrak{q}$. Since

$$\text{length}[1_\mathfrak{q}, 1_{\mathfrak{p}_1}] < \text{length}[1_\mathfrak{q}, 1_\mathfrak{p}],$$

by the inductive hypothesis, we conclude that $\mathfrak{p}_1 \xrightarrow{\text{p}} \mathfrak{q}$. Combining this relation with $\mathfrak{p} \overset{\text{dn}}{\sim} \mathfrak{p}_1$, we obtain (20), completing the proof for Case 1.

Case 2: $[a, c]$ is not a prime interval. Let $e = a \vee 1_\mathfrak{q} \leq c$. Choose an element b so that $a < b \prec c$, see Figure 12, and let $\mathfrak{p}_1 = [b, e]$. Then

$$\mathfrak{p} \xrightarrow{\text{p-dn}} \mathfrak{p}_1 \tag{22}$$

established by the $\mathsf{N}_5 = \{a, 0_\mathfrak{p}, 1_\mathfrak{p}, b, e\}$. We apply Lemma 4 with $\mathfrak{p}_1 = [x, i]$, $a = u$,



FIGURE 12. The elements for the inductive step, Case 2

$\mathfrak{q} = [v, w]$, and $o = d$. Then we conclude that $0_{\mathfrak{p}_1} \wedge 1_\mathfrak{q} = b \wedge 1_\mathfrak{q} < 0_\mathfrak{q}$, therefore,

$$\mathfrak{p}_1 \overset{\text{p-dn}}{\longrightarrow} \mathfrak{q}. \tag{23}$$

Now (22) and (23) imply that $\mathfrak{p} \overset{\text{p-dn}}{\longrightarrow} \mathfrak{q}$, which we are required to prove. □

Now we are ready to prove the Swing Lemma. Let L be an SPS lattice and let $\mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{q}$ be distinct prime intervals in L so that $\mathfrak{q}$ is collapsed by $\operatorname{con}(\mathfrak{p})$. By the Prime-projectivity Lemma, there exists a sequence of pairwise distinct prime intervals $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{u}_0, \mathfrak{u}_1, \ldots, \mathfrak{u}_n = \mathfrak{q}$ satisfying

$$\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{u}_0 \overset{\text{p}}{\longrightarrow} \mathfrak{u}_1 \overset{\text{p}}{\longrightarrow} \cdots \overset{\text{p}}{\longrightarrow} \mathfrak{u}_n = \mathfrak{q}. \tag{24}$$

If $\mathfrak{u}_{i-1} \overset{\text{p-up}}{\longrightarrow} \mathfrak{u}_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, then $\mathfrak{u}_{i-1} \overset{\text{up}}{\sim} \mathfrak{u}_i$ by semimodularity. If $\mathfrak{u}_{i-1} \overset{\text{p-dn}}{\longrightarrow} \mathfrak{u}_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, then by Lemma 6, we get a sequence of down perspectivities and swings. So (24) turns into a sequence of up perspectivities, down perspectivities, and swings. By Lemma 2(i) (or Lemma 3), a down perceptivity cannot be followed by an up perceptivity. By Lemma 2.(v), a swing cannot be followed by an up perceptivity. So if there is an up perceptivity, it must be the first binary relation. Since two down perspectivities can be replaced by one and two swings can be replaced by one, we conclude that the sequence of binary relations start with at most one up perceptivity, followed by an alternating sequence of down perspectivities and swings, as claimed by the Swing Lemma.

5. Concluding comments

My paper [11] presents an alternative proof of the Swing Lemma. G. Czédli applies in [3] the Trajectory Coloring Theorem for Slim Rectangular Lattices of

G. Czédli [1, Theorem 7.3] to prove the Swing Lemma for rectangular lattices, which is then extended to SPS lattices in [11, Lemma 7].

In [12, Section 4], I present a number of interesting applications of the Swing Lemma. For instance, it is proved that coverings in the order, $\mathrm{J}(\mathrm{Con}\, L)$, of join-irreducible congruences of an SPS lattice L are represented by proper swings. (A swing $\mathfrak{p} \smile \mathfrak{q}$ is *proper*, if $0_\mathfrak{p}$ is the left-most or the right-most element covered by $1_\mathfrak{p} = 1_\mathfrak{q}$.) Only the first swing in (2) may be not proper (and only if $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{r}$).

In [12, Section 4], the Swing Lemma is used to proved that in an SPS lattice L, the order $\mathrm{J}(\mathrm{Con}\, L)$ has the property that every element is covered by at most two elements. G. Czédli [2] proves that the converse does not hold. The order P of Figure 13 has this property, but it cannot be represented as $\mathrm{J}\,(\mathrm{Con}\, L)$ for any SPS lattice L. See my paper [14] for a different proof.



FIGURE 13. The lattice D_8 and the order $P = \mathrm{J}\,(D_8)$

It would be interesting to see whether the Swing Lemma will be useful in resolving the problem of characterizing congruence lattices of SPS lattices.

REFERENCES

[1] G. Czédli, *Patch extensions and trajectory colorings of slim rectangular lattices,* Algebra Universalis **72** (2014), 125–154.

[2] ———, *A note on congruence lattices of slim semimodular lattices,* Algebra Universalis **72** (2014) 225–230.

[3] ———, *Diagrams and rectangular extensions of planar semimodular lattices.* arXiv 1412.4453

[4] G. Czédli and G. Grätzer, *Planar Semimodular Lattices: Structure and Diagrams.* Chapter 3 in [24].

[5] G. Czédli and E. T. Schmidt, *The Jordan-Hölder theorem with uniqueness for groups and semimodular lattices,* Algebra Universalis 66 (2011), no. 1-2, 6979

[6] ———, *Slim semimodular lattices. I. A visual approach,* Order **29** (2012), 481-497.

[7] ———, *Slim semimodular lattices. II. A description by patchwork systems,* Order **30** (2013), 689–721.

[8] G. Grätzer, The Congruences of a Finite Lattice, A *Proof-by-Picture* Approach. Birkhäuser Boston, 2006. xxiii+281 pp. ISBN: 0-8176-3224-7.

[9] G. Grätzer, Lattice Theory: Foundation. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2011. xxix+613 pp. ISBN: 978-3-0348-0017-4.

[10] G. Grätzer, *Planar Semimodular Lattices: Congruences.* Chapter 4 in [24].

[11] G. Grätzer, *Congruences and prime-perspectivities in finite lattices.* Algebra Universalis. arXiv: 1312.2537

[12] ———, *Congruences of fork extensions of lattices.* Algebra Universalis. arXiv: 1307.8404
[13] ———, *A technical lemma for congruences of finite lattices.* Algebra Universalis. arXiv: 1307.8404
[14] ———, *On a result of Gábor Czédli concerning congruence lattices of planar semimodular lattices.* Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged). arXiv 1403.3875
[15] ———, *Congruences and trajectories in planar semimodular lattices.* Algebra Universalis. arXiv: 1406.0439
[16] G. Grätzer, H. Lakser, and E. T. Schmidt, *Congruence lattices of finite semimodular lattices.* Canad. Math. Bull. **41** (1998), 290–297.
[17] G. Grätzer and E. Knapp, *Notes on planar semimodular lattices. I. Construction.* Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **73** (2007), 445–462.
[18] ———, *A note on planar semimodular lattices.* Algebra Universalis **58** (2008), 497–499.
[19] ———, *Notes on planar semimodular lattices. II. Congruences.* Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **74** (2008), 37–47.
[20] ———, *Notes on planar semimodular lattices. III. Rectangular lattices.* Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **75** (2009), 29–48.
[21] ———, *Notes on planar semimodular lattices. IV. The size of a minimal congruence lattice representation with rectangular lattices.* Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **76** (2010), 3–26.
[22] G. Grätzer and E. T. Schmidt, *A short proof of the congruence representation theorem for semimodular lattices.* arXiv: 1303.4464. Algebra Universalis (2014).
[23] ———, *An extension theorem for planar semimodular lattices.* Periodica Mathematica Hungarica (2014). arXiv: 1304.7489
[24] G. Grätzer and F. Wehrung eds., Lattice Theory: Special Topics and Applications. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel.
[25] J. Jakubík, *Congruence relations and weak projectivity in lattices,* (Slovak) Časopis Pěst. Mat. **80** (1955), 206–216.

Department of Mathematics, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2, Canada
E-mail address, G. Grätzer: gratzer@me.com
URL, G. Grätzer: http://server.math.umanitoba.ca/homepages/gratzer/